



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,976	07/09/2003	Mitsuichi Hiratsuka	116493	8810
25944	7590	07/19/2006	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			MARC, MCDIEUNEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3661	

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/614,976

Applicant(s)

HIRATSUKA ET AL.

Examiner

McDieunel Marc

Art Unit

3661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/26/2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-13 are presented for examination.
2. The rejection to claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Ghodoussi *et al.*** (U.S. Pat. Pub. 20030144649A1) is **maintained**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Ghodoussi *et al.*** (U.S. Pat. Pub. 20030144649A1).

As per claims 1 and 7, **Ghodoussi *et al.*** teaches with respect to claims 1 and 7 “ Tele-Medicine System That Transmits And Entire State Of A Subsystem” having a remote control method for remotely controlling a robot controller (see fig. 1, particularly the remote controllers) through a universal communication network by using a general-purpose terminal (see figs. 1, 7, element 148) by a terminal disposed remote from the robot controller (see fig. 7, elements 50 and 52), comprising: enabling the general-

purpose terminal to remotely control the robot controller by a functional connecting device located on a robot controller-side of the network (see figs. 1 and 7), the functional connecting device being capable of enabling the general-purpose terminal to remotely control the robot controller through the universal communication network (see fig. 7); and performing a predetermined operation on the robot controller using the general-purpose terminal (see fig. 1), note that predetermined operation implies that the surgeons on figure 1 for instance knew what type of operation to perform on a particular patient. Also note that Ghodoussi *et al.* contains two surgeon consoles/ **ZEUS**¹s. It is inherent, but also well known that each handle of Ghodoussi *et al.*'s system works in combination with software command through a computer system in a conferencing manner via a network.

Ghodoussi *et al.* teaches a robot type, wherein a Computer Motion of Goleta, Calif. provides a system under the trademark **ZEUS**[®] that allows a surgeon to perform minimally invasive surgery, including CABG procedures. The procedure is performed with instruments that are inserted through small incisions in the patient's chest. The instruments are controlled by robotic arms. Movement of the robotic arms and actuation of instrument end effectors are controlled by the surgeon through a pair of handles and a foot pedal that are coupled to an electronic controller. Alternatively, the surgeon can control the movement of an "endoscope used to view the internal organs of the patient through voice commands. The handles and a screen are typically integrated into a console that is operated by the surgeon to control the various robotic arms and medical instruments of a **ZEUS**[®] system. Utilizing a robotic system to perform surgery requires

¹ The **ZEUS7** Surgery Robotic System is similar to the **Da Vinci**[™] system. At a console the surgeon controls the instrument handles while viewing the operative area on a monitor. Using a computer interface the surgical instruments attached to a three arms robot mimic the surgeon's movements on a real time on the patient as seen in figure. One of the arms is designed for the endoscope controlled by voice control. The technology available eliminates the slight hand tremors of the surgeon and also allow the surgeon to scale their natural movements to a microscopic scale. The **ZEUS** system has many advantages such as small incision about the diameter of pencil, reduced patient pain and trauma, and short hospital stays.

a certain amount of training. It would be desirable to provide a system that would allow a second surgeon to assist another surgeon in controlling a robotic medical system. The second surgeon could both teach and assist a surgeon learning to perform a medical procedure with a ZEUS system. This would greatly reduce the time required to learn the operation of a robotically assisted medical system, also (see figs. 1-9, 11, 12 and pages 2-7).

With respect to claims 2 and 8, Ghoduoussi *et al.* teaches a robot, wherein the step of enabling the terminal to remote control the robot controller is executed by sending a connect program from the functional connecting device to the terminal in response to a request made by the terminal (see figs. 1, 7 and sections [0047-0051], inherently meets the above limitation), note that the surgeon console being taken as terminal as well.

With respect to claims 3 and 9, Ghoduoussi *et al.* teaches a robot that further comprising a step of converting information of a format sent from the terminal to the robot controller into information of another format that can be processed by the robot controller by the functional connecting device (see fig. 7, element 148 inherently meet the limitations).

With respect to claim 4, Ghoduoussi *et al.* teaches a robot, wherein the step of performing the predetermined operation is executed by retrieving desired information from the robot controller through the functional connecting device by the terminal (see figs. 1, 7 and sections [0048-0052, 0054-0058]).

With respect to claims 5, 6, 11 and 12, Ghoduoussi *et al.* teaches a robot, wherein operations performed by the terminal on the robot controller are limited; information retrievable from the robot controller by the terminal is limited (see fig. 1, wherein inherently the terminal/**ZEUS®** system being limited to its capacity to perform operations and retrieve information), note that the above limitations is based on design choice wherein the hardware and software can be implemented.

With respect to claim 10, Ghodoussi *et al.* teaches a robot, wherein the terminal retrieves desired information from the robot controller through the functional connecting device by the predetermined operation (see figs. 1, 7 and 8).

With respect to claim 13, Ghodoussi *et al.* teaches a robot, wherein the functional connecting device is included in the robot controller (see figs. 1, 2, 7, 8 and 11, particularly the handles).

Response to Arguments

As to the reference not teaching a general-purpose terminal, such limitation has not been previously presented, however it does not change the scope of the claim, and any general-purpose terminal does not have patentable weight. Ghodoussi's contains a general-purpose terminal which being used as interface device.

As to the reference recognize the problems inherent in remote control system....such language has not been claimed.

As to the reference not teaching remotely controlling a robot controller using a general-purpose terminal (see Ghodoussi's fig. 1 and the above explanation).

5. Applicant's arguments filed 8/26/2005 fully considered but they are not persuasive.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to McDieunel Marc whose telephone number is (571) 272-6964. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-5:00 Mon-Thu.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 3661


you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



McDieunel (Marc)
Examiner
Art Unit 3661

Friday, December, 02, 2005

MM/



THOMAS BLACK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER